

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JANE ROE,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
FRITO-LAY, INC.,  
Defendant.

Case No. [14-cv-00751-HSG](#) (KAW)

**ORDER TERMINATING PLAINTIFF'S  
1/27/16 DISCOVERY LETTER**


Re: Dkt. No. 68

On January 27, 2016, Plaintiff Jane Roe filed a discovery letter brief, because Defendant Frito-Lay did not participate in the drafting of the letter. (Letter, Dkt. No. 68 at 1.) The letter relates to allegedly deficient discovery responses served in October 2014. *Id.* Plaintiff is correct that she is entitled to verified interrogatory responses. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(5). Plaintiff is not, however, entitled to verified responses to requests for admission or requests for production.

The parties are reminded of their ongoing obligation to supplement their responses under Rule 26(e), and are ordered to meet and confer regarding the disputes identified in Plaintiff's letter, including scheduling depositions at a time that is convenient to the parties and witnesses. *See* Civil L.R. 30-1. The parties shall also keep in mind the Northern District's Guidelines for Professional Conduct ([http://cand.uscourts.gov/professional\\_conduct\\_guidelines](http://cand.uscourts.gov/professional_conduct_guidelines)), i.e. ¶ 9(b) (Discovery). *See also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 1 (encourages the "just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding"). Should the parties be unable to resolve these disputes without court intervention, they shall file a joint letter that complies with the undersigned's standing order. (*See* Judge Westmore's General Standing Order ¶¶ 12-13.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 8, 2016

  
KANDIS A. WESTMORE  
United States Magistrate Judge